IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

R.S.A. No. 3636 of 2005
Date of decision Februrary 1, 2007

Mithu Ram

.....Appellant

Versus

Seema Bansal

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINEY MITTAL

Present:- Sh. R. N. Raina Advocate
for the appellant.
Sh. Chetan Mittal, Advocate for the respondent.

****

Viney Mittal, J (Oral)

The defendant is appellant before this Court. He has concurrently lost before the two Courts below in a suit for recovery filed by the plaintiff.

The findings of fact recorded by the two Courts below have already been upheld by this Court vide order dated October 3, 2005. However, notice of motion was issued only on the limited ground with regard to the rate of future interest.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the recovery of the amount in question was sought by the plaintiff on account of commercial transactions. I do not find that the future interest granted by the two Courts below is excessive in any manner. No case for interference by this Court is made out.

No question of law, much less any substantial question of law, arises in the present appeal.

Dismissed.

(VINEY MITTAL)
JUDGE

February 1, 2007
archana